

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

JAN 25 2008

LAW OFFICE OF
HENRY T. BRENDZEL

Date: January 25, 2008	
To: Examiner: Thujuan Knowlin Addy	From: Henry T. Brendzel, Esq
Fax: 571-272-8300	Fax: (973) 467-6589
Phone: 571-272-7486	Phone: (973) 467-2025
Re: Serial No: 10/719418	Pages: Cover + 7

JAN 25 2008

Henry Brendzel


TRANSMITTAL FORM (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)		Complete if Known	
		Application Number	10719418
		Filing Date	11/24/2003
		First Named Inventor	Wesley A. Brush
		Examiner Name	Thujuan Knowlin Addy
		Group/Art Unit	2642
Total number of pages in this Submission: this page, plus	6	Attorney Docket ID	Brush 113579con

If Fee Form is not included, but a fee is due, the Commissioner is Authorized to charge Deposit Account of Henry T. Brendzel No 500732 of, and consider that appropriate requests that give rise to the fees (such as for an extension of time) have been made.

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)

<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Form (<input type="checkbox"/> Check included) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Response <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavit(s)/Declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.2 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Declaration (no Missing Parts Notice) <input type="checkbox"/> Assignment Papers (for an Application) <input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> To Convert a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation or Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> To Convert to Statutory Invention Registration	<input type="checkbox"/> Postcard(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Small Entity Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Request for a Refund <input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to group <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communications to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input type="checkbox"/> Other
--	---	--

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm or Individual Name	Henry T. Brendzel	
Signature		Date 1/25/08

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

- ☐ 1st class mail: I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service, First Class Mail service, in an envelop addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA22313-1450 on the date shown herein.
- ☒ Fax: I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically transmitted by facsimile to the United States Patent Office on the date shown herein.

Henry Brendzel
 Name of Person Signing


 Signature

1/25/08
 Date

Brush 113579con

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****IN THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE****JAN 25 2008****Patent Application**

Inventor(s)	Wesley A. Brush	Serial No.	10/719418
	James M. Carnazza	Filing Date	11/24/2003
	Romel Khan	Examiner	Thujuan Knowlin Addy
Case Name	Brush 113579con	Art Unit	2642
Title	System and Method for Using an Intelligent Peripheral to Supply Telephone Service		

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

SIR:

**AMENDMENT AFTER FINAL
REMARKS**

This is in response to an Office action dated December 20, 2007, where claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Iapalucci, US Patent 5,732,130. Applicants respectfully traverse.

A telephone interview was held with Examiner Addy on January 23, 2003 following an informal submission of the arguments that are presented below relative to claims 1 and 2. The Examiner's courtesy is greatly appreciated.

The Examiner stated that she performed a supplemental search but found no art that invalidates the claims, and that she studied and understood applicants' arguments relative to claim 1. The Examiner did not have a chance to carefully study the claim 2 arguments, so she expressed no opinion relative to that claim.

Claim 1

The current rejection under 35 USC 102 is the same as the one that was lodged in the previous Office action, where in a filed response applicants argued that the claim 1 step of

an intelligent peripheral receiving an alert message from a database unit, which message specifies a communication protocol parameter